

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
AT KNOXVILLE

DANIEL MICHAEL WEBBER,

Plaintiff,

v.

3:11-cv-341

ANDERSON COUNTY DETENTION FACILITY,
C/O REYNOLDS, SGT. B. ALLEN, LT. PARKER,
and CAPT. DAVIDSON,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

The court is in receipt of a *pro se* prisoner's civil rights complaint under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. It appears from the application that the plaintiff lacks sufficient financial resources to pay the \$350.00 filing fee. Accordingly, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(4), the Clerk is **DIRECTED** to file this action without the prepayment of costs or fees or security therefor as of the date the complaint was received. However, for the reasons stated below, process shall not issue and this action is **DISMISSED**.

Plaintiff is an inmate in the Anderson County Detention Facility. He brings this action against the facility itself and four officers at the facility. The court notes at the outset that the Anderson County Detention Facility is not a suable entity under § 1983. *See Matthews v. Jones*, 35 F.3d 1046, 1049 (6th Cir. 1994) (a police department is not an entity which can be sued under § 1983); *see also De La Garza v. Kandiyohi County Jail*, 18 F. App'x 436, 437 (8th Cir. 2001) (neither a county jail nor a sheriff's department is a suable entity); *Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1214 (11th Cir. 1992) ("[s]heriff's departments and police departments are not usually considered legal entities subject to suit").

With respect to the individual defendants, plaintiff claims that he has been placed in protective custody based upon his pending charge for aggravated rape and that the defendants refuse to move him to general population, despite his request to do so. Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief as well as money damages. Plaintiff's complaint, however, fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted because prisoners "have no inherent due process right to have their security level downgraded or to be released from protective custody upon request." *Howard v. Grinage*, 6 F.3d 410, 412 (6th Cir. 1993).

To the extent plaintiff also alleges that he has been discriminated against because an African American prisoner with the same pending charges was allowed to move to general population, this allegation also fails to state a claim for relief. "To state a claim under the Equal Protection Clause, a § 1983 plaintiff must allege that a state actor intentionally discriminated against the plaintiff because of membership in a protected class." *Johnson v. Morel*, 876 F.2d 477, 479 (5th Cir. 1989), (citing *Washington v. Davis*, 426 U.S. 229, 247-48

(1976)). The class of individuals protected by the Equal Protection Clause are "those so-called 'discrete and insular' minorities" that receive special protection because of "inherent personal characteristics." *Browder v. Tipton*, 630 F.2d 1149, 1149 (6th Cir. 1980). Plaintiff does not claim membership in a protected class.

Although this court is mindful that a *pro se* complaint is to be liberally construed, *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972), it is quite clear that the plaintiff has not alleged the deprivation of any constitutionally protected right, privilege or immunity, and, therefore, the court finds his claims to be frivolous under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915(e) and 1915A. It appears beyond doubt that plaintiff can prove no set of facts which would entitle him to relief, *Malone v. Colyer*, 710 F.2d 258 (6th Cir. 1983), and that plaintiff's claim lacks an arguable basis in law and fact, *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). Therefore, this action is **DISMISSED** *sua sponte*, as frivolous and for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be granted under § 1983. The court **CERTIFIES** that any appeal from this action would not be taken in good faith and would be totally frivolous. *See* Rule 24 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Because the plaintiff is an inmate in the Anderson County Detention Facility, he is herewith **ASSESSED** the civil filing fee of \$350.00. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1)(A) and (B), the custodian of the plaintiff's inmate trust account at the institution where he now resides is directed to submit to the Clerk, U.S. District Court, 800 Market Street, Suite 130, Knoxville, Tennessee 37902, as an initial partial payment, whichever is greater of:

(a) twenty percent (20%) of the average monthly deposits to the plaintiff's inmate trust account; *or*

(b) twenty percent (20%) of the average monthly balance in the plaintiff's inmate trust account for the six-month period preceding the filing of the complaint.

Thereafter, the custodian shall submit twenty percent (20%) of the plaintiff's preceding monthly income (or income credited to the plaintiff's trust account for the preceding month), but only when such monthly income exceeds ten dollars (\$10.00), until the full filing fee of three hundred fifty dollars (\$350.00) as authorized under 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) has been paid to the Clerk. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(2).

The Clerk is **DIRECTED** to send a copy of this Memorandum and Order to the Sheriff of Anderson County, Tennessee, and the county attorney for Anderson County, Tennessee, to ensure that the custodian of the plaintiff's inmate trust account complies with that portion of the Prison Litigation Reform Act relating to payment of the filing fee. The Clerk is further **DIRECTED** to forward a copy of this Memorandum and Order to the court's financial deputy.

ENTER:

s/ Thomas W. Phillips
United States District Judge